arXiv:math/0508403v1 [math.CO] 22 Aug 2005

Random walks on the hypergroup of circles in a finite field

Le Anh Vinh
School of Mathematics
University of New South Wales
Sydney 2052 Australia

February 2, 2008

Abstract

In this paper we study random walks on the hypergroup of circles in a finite field of prime order $p = 4l + 3$. We investigate the behavior of random walks on this hypergroup, the equilibrium distribution and the mixing times. We use two different approaches—comparison of Dirichlet Forms (geometric bound of eigenvalues), and coupling methods, to show that the mixing time of random walks on hypergroup of circles is only linear.

1 Preliminary

Suppose that p is a prime of the form $p = 4l + 3$ for some integer l, and that $\mathbb{F}_p$ is the field with p elements. The following definition follows [7], where the importance of the notion of quadrance is developed.

Definition 1 *The* ***circle*** *in F_p with* ***center*** $A_0 = [x, y]$ *and* ***quadrance*** K *is the set of all points $[u, v]$ in $F_p \times F_p$ such that*

$$(u - x)^2 + (v - y)^2 = K \,(\mathrm{mod}\, p)\,.$$

There are exactly p circles with center $O = [0, 0]$, with quadrances $0, 1, 2, \ldots, p - 1$; we denote them by $C_0, C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_{p-1}$ respectively. If we start from $O = [0, 0]$, take a random step by translating by an element of C_i, and then take another random step by translating by an element of C_j, the final point will be an element of C_k for some k. Counting over all

possible such combinations, there are N_{ij}^k ways to reach to a point of C_k by using steps from C_i, then C_j randomly. We can write this relation as

$$C_i C_j = \sum_k N_{ij}^k C_k,$$

where $N_{ij}^k$are non-negative integers. Let $n_{ij}^k = \frac{N_{ij}^k}{|C_i||C_j|}$ then it can be written as distribution form

$$c_i c_j = \sum_k n_{ij}^k c_k$$

where $n_{ij}^k \geqslant 0$ and $\sum_k n_{ij}^k = 1$ for any i, j.

Theorem 1 *Suppose p is a prime of the form $p = 4l + 3$ for some integer l. Given i, j non-zero and k in $\mathbb{F}_p$, let $V = ij - \frac{(k-i-j)^2}{4}$. Then we have the following formulas for N_{ij}^k and n_{ij}^k. i) If V is not a square in F_p then $N_{ij}^k = 0$ and $n_{ij}^k = 0$. ii) If $V = 0$ then $N_{ij}^k = |C_i| = p + 1$ and $n_{ij}^k = \frac{1}{p+1}$. iii) Otherwise, $N_{ij}^k = 2|C_i| = 2(p + 1)$ and $n_{ij}^k = \frac{2}{p+1}$.*

Proof In this case $|C_0| = 1, |C_i| = p + 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, p - 1$. We start from $[0, 0]$, and translate by C_i, to reach to a point, say (x, y) where $x^2 + y^2 = i \pmod p$ (we will not write mod p from now). From (x, y), we translate by (u, v) in C_j so that $u^2 + v^2 = j$ (there are $|C_j|$ such possible moves from (x, y)). We will reach a point in C_k if and only if

$$(x + u)^2 + (y + v)^2 = k$$

or

$$xu + yv = \frac{k - i - j}{2}$$

Recall the well-known identity

$$(x^2 + y^2)(u^2 + v^2) = (xu + yv)^2 + (yu - xv)^2.$$

Thus the condition is equivalent to $(yu - xv)^2 = ij - \frac{(k-i-j)^2}{4} = V$.

(i) If V is not a square in F_p then it is clear that there does not exist such x, y, u, v. Hence $N_{ij}^k = n_{ij}^k = 0$.

(ii) If $V = 0$ or $ij = (k-i-j)^2/4$ then $(yu-xv)^2 = 0$ or $yu = xv$. We can assume that $x \neq 0$. From $v = yu/x$, we have $j = u^2 + v^2 = ((y/x)^2 + 1)u^2 = iu^2/x^2$ or $u^2/x^2 = j/i$. Since ij is square so $j/i = m^2$ for some $1 \leqslant m \leqslant \frac{p-1}{2}$. Thus $u/x = \pm m$, $u = \pm mx$, and $v = \pm my$.

We need $xu + yv = (k - i - j)/2$, so $\pm m(x^2 + y^2) = (k - i - j)/2$ or $\pm\sqrt{ij} = (k-i-j)/2$. Since $(k-i-j)^2/4 = ij$ we can choose exactly either m or $-m$ to make this requirement hold. Therefore, for each (x, y) in C_i, we have only one (u, v) in C_j such that if we go by (x, y) followed by (u, v), we reach to a point in circle C_k. In other words, $N_{ij}^k = |C_i| = p + 1$.

(iii) If $V = m^2 \neq 0$. Set $a = (k - i - j)/2$ and $b = yu - xv$ ($b = m$ or $b = -m$), it follows that $xu + yv = a$ and $yu - xv = b$. Solving these equations we have $u = (ax+by)/i$ and $v = (ay-bx)/i$. It is straight forward to verify that $(u, v) \in C_j$ and $(x+u, y+v) \in C_k$ if $(x, y) \in C_i$. Since $m \neq 0$, for each $(x, y) \in C_i$, we have two posibilities to go to C_k by C_j. Therefore $N_{ij}^k = 2|C_i| = 2(p + 1)$, completing the proof. □

To see the fact that the circles equipped with random walks product create a hypergroup structure, recall the formal definition of (general) hypergroup (see [6]).

Definition 2 *A (finite) general hypergroup is a pair $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{A})$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is a *-algebra with unit c_0 over C and $\mathcal{K} = \{c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_n\}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{A}$ satisfying*

1. *$\mathcal{K}$ is a bsis of $\mathcal{A}$*
2. *$\mathcal{K}^* = \mathcal{K}$*
3. *The struture constants $n_{ij}^k \in C$ defined by*

$$c_i c_j = \sum_k n_{ij}^k c_k$$

satisfy the conditions

$$c_i^* = c_j \Leftrightarrow n_{ij}^0 > 0,$$

$$c_i^* = c_j \Leftrightarrow n_{ij}^0 > 0$$

$\mathcal{K}$ is called *hermitian* if $c_i^* = c_i$ for all i, commutative if $c_i c_j = c_j c_i$ for all i, j, *real* if n_{ij}^k if $n_{ij}^k \in R$ for all i, j, k, *positive* if $n_{ij}^k \geqslant 0$ for all i, j, k and *normalized* if $\sum_k n_{ij}^k = 1$ for all i, j. A generalized hypergroup which is both positive and normalized will be called a hypergroup. There are board examples and applications of (generalized) hypergroups which can be found in [7].

Now, we show that the set $C = \{c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{p-1}\}$ with the relation $c_i c_j = \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} n_{ij}^k c_k$ (defined above) is indeed a hypergroup. Let $n_{ij}^k = \frac{N_{ij}^k}{|C_i||C_j|}$ then

$c_i c_j = \sum_k n_{ij}^k c_k$. It is clear that $n_{ij}^k \geqslant 0$, and $\sum_k n_{ij}^k = 1$ for any i, j. From Theorem 1, $n_{ij}^0 \neq 0$ if and only if $ij - (0-i-j)^2/4 = -(i-j)^2/4$ is square. If $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ then -1 is not a square in F_p, so $n_{ij}^0 \neq 0$ if and only if $i = j$. Let $c_i^* = c_i$ then C is a hermitian commutative hypergroup (note that, n_{ij}^k is symmetric w.r.t i, j and k so C is commutative). For $p \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, the null circle is extraodinary and yields many troubles in calculations so we restrict our interests in case $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ throughout this paper.

We also need the following theorem which is first proved by the author in [6] (a long proof using quadratic residue method). We present here a robust proof obtained directly from Theorem 1.

Theorem 2 *For any $i, j, k \in F_p$ ($p \equiv 3$ mod 4) , we write $c_i c_j c_k = \sum_l \alpha_{ijk}^l c_l$ then $\alpha_{ijk}^l > 0$ if i, j, k, l are all non-zero. If one of i, j, k, l is zero, let x, y, z be three remaining numbers then $\alpha_{ijk}^l > 0$ iff $xy - (z-x-y)^2/4$ is square in F_p.*

Proof If one of i, j, k, l is zero then it becomes: for three remaining numbers, x, y,and z are we have a triangle with quadrances x, y and z (note that a step from C_0 when $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ is a stationary step). By Theorem 1, it holds if and only if $V = xy-(z-x-y)^2/4$ is square. Now we assume that i, j, k and l are all nonzero. It is clear that C_l is reachable by steps from C_i, C_j then C_k if and only if we can start from $(0, 0)$, go by steps from C_i, C_j, C_k then C_l to come back to $(0, 0)$. Now, from $(0, 0)$, go a step from C_i, followed by a step from C_j we have $|C_i||C_j| = (p+1)^2$ possible steps. From Theorem 1, there is no more than $2(p+1)$ steps that can reach the same circles. So, by choosing steps from C_i then C_j, we can reach at least $(p+1)^2/2(p+1) = (p+1)/2$ circles. Applying the same argument, by choosing steps from C_l then C_k (start from $(0, 0)$), we can reach at least $(p+1)/2$ circles. Since we have only p circles, by the Pigeon Holes Principle, there exists a circle say C_t that is reachable from both directions. Therefore, we can go by C_i, C_j from $(0, 0)$ to C_t; then from C_t, go by C_k to C_l. The statement follows. □

2 Random walks on hypergroup of circles

In this section, we will consider the random walk by C_1, i.e. we choose all steps from the unit circle C_1. We call it random walk C_1 by abuse of notation. In general, at n^{th} step we have the relation

$$c_1^n = \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \alpha_{n,j} c_j$$

where $\alpha_{n,j} \geqslant 0$ for $j = 0, \ldots, p-1$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \alpha_{n,j} = 1$.

From Theorem 2, after no more than 4 steps, we will reach all circles at every state. Thus, $\alpha_{n,j} > 0$ for all $i = 0, \ldots, p-1$ and $n \geqslant 4$.

Let K be a Markov kernel. The probability π is invariant or stationary for K if $\pi K = \pi$. A Markov kernel K is irreducible if for any two states x, y there exists an integer $n = n(x, y)$ such that $K_n(x, y) > 0$. A state x is called aperiodic if $K_n(x, x) > 0$ for all sufficiently large n. If K is irreducible and has an aperiodic state then all states are aperiodic and K is *erogodic*.

Let K be c_1, i.e $K(c_i, c_j) = n_{i1}^j$. Our main interest in this section is the iterated kernel $K_n(x, y)$. We write K as c_1 and K_n as c_1^n. By Theorem 2, from C_j we can go to C_i by no more than 2 steps from C_1. Thus, K is irreducible. Besides, $c_1^n(c_1, c_1) > 0$ for all $n > 3$, so K has an aperiodic state. Thus all states are aperiodic.

The following definition gives us the total variation distance between two probability measures.

Definition 3 *Let μ, ν be two probability measures on the set X. The total variation distance is defined by*

$$d_{\mathrm{TV}}(\mu, \nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \max_{A \subset X} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in X} |\mu(x) - \nu(x)|.$$

Ergodic Markov chains are useful algorithmic tools in which, regardless of their initial state, they eventually reach a unique stationary distribution. The following theorem, originally proved by Doeblin, details the essential property of ergodic Markov chains.

Theorem 3 *Let K be any ergodic Markov kernel on a finite state space X then K admits a unique stationary distribution π such that*

$$\forall x, y \in X, \lim_{t \to \infty} K_t(x, y) = \pi(y).$$

From Theorem 3, the Markov kernel K (i.e C_1) admits a unique invariant distribution π. For all c_i, c_j $\lim_{n \to \infty} c_1^n(c_i, c_j) = \pi(y)$. In general, it is difficult to determine this unique stationary distribution. However, in this case, it can be found easily by the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *If there exists a distribution π such that*

$$\pi(x)K(x, y) = \pi(y)K(y, x) \text{ for all } x, y \in X$$

then such a π is a stationary distribution. (in this case, K is called reversible*)*

From Theorem 3 and Lemma 1, we now can tell exactly the behaviour of c_1^n as n goes to infinity.

Theorem 4 *Over the finite field $F_p(p \in \mathcal{P} > 3)$, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} c_1^n = \frac{1}{p^2}c_0 + \frac{p+1}{p^2}(c_1 + c_2 + \ldots + c_{p-1}).$$

Proof We know that the kernel Markov A_1 (of c_1) is erogodic. From Theorem 3, there exists a unique stationary distribution π of A_1. Let's consider a distribution σ on C which is defined as $\sigma(c_0) = 1/p^2$ and $\sigma(c_j) = (p+1)/p^2$ for all $j > 0$. We see that $A_1(c_i, c_j) = c_1(c_i, c_j) = n_{i1}^j$. By Lemma 1, to show that $\pi = \sigma$, we only need to verify that $\sigma(c_i)n_{i1}^j = \sigma(c_j)n_{j1}^i$. If $i, j \neq 0$ then this equation clearly holds by the symmetricity of n_{ij}^k w.r.t i, j and k (when $i, j, k \neq 0$). If $i = 0$, then $n_{01}^j, n_{j1}^0 \neq 0$ if and only if $j = 1$. And if $j = 1$ then $n_{01}^1 = 1$ and $n_{11}^0 = 1/(p+1)$. The equation still holds. Thus, for any i and j, we have $\sigma(c_i)n_{i1}^j = \sigma(c_j)n_{j1}^i$. Therefore, $\pi = \sigma$, completing the proof. □

Note that $|C_o| = 1, |C_1| = |C_2| = \ldots = |C_{p-1}| = p+1$, and the space has p^2 points, so the distribution of c_1^n is, in some sense, close to uniform over the space F_p^2 when n tends to infinite. Walking randomly by any $C_i (i \neq 0)$ we have the same results as for C_1. In hypergroup language the limiting distribution is the Haar measure on the hypergroup.

We proved that c_1^n tends to the unique stationary distribution of the hypergroup of circles, but we give no infomation about the rate of convergence as a function of the size of the hypergroup, i.e $|C| = p$. We define the *mixing time* $\tau_p(\varepsilon)$ as the time until the chain is within variation distance ε from the worst initial state. We give a formal definition for this concept.

Definition 4 $\tau_p(\varepsilon) = \max_{i\in\{0,\ldots,p-1\}} \min\{t : d_{\mathrm{TV}}(c_1^t(c_i, .), \pi) \leqslant \varepsilon\}$ *where π is the distribution in Theorem 4.*

We can fix ε as any small constant. A popular choice is to set $\varepsilon = 1/2e$. We then boost to arbitrary small variation distance by the following lemma.

Lemma 2 $\tau_p(\varepsilon) \leqslant \tau_p(1/2e)\ln(1/e)$.

We now want to estimate $\tau_p = \tau_p(1/2e)$. We will present two different approaches to estimate this mixing time.

2.1 Comparision of Dirichlet Forms

The first approach is using the comparsion of Dirichlet forms to estimate τ_p. We first need some preliminaries. Let X be a finite set. Let $K(x,y), \pi(x)$ be a reversible irreducible Markov chain on X. Let $l^2(X)$ have scalar product

$$< f, g >= \sum_{x \in X} f(x)g(x)\pi(x).$$

From the reversibility of π and K, the operator $f \mapsto Kf$, with $Kf(x) = \sum f(y)K(x,y)$, is self-adjoint on l^2 with eigenvalues $\alpha_1 = 1 > \alpha_2 \geqslant \ldots \geqslant \alpha_{|X|-1} \geqslant -1$. These eigenvalues can be characterized by the Dirichlet form D, which is defined as

$$D(f,f) =< (I-K)f, f >= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,y}(f(x)-f(y))^2\pi(x)K(x,y).$$

Let V be a subspace of $L^2(X)$, set

$$M_D(V) = \max\{D(f,f); \|f\|_2 = 1, f \in V\},$$
$$m_D(V) = \min\{D(f,f); \|f\|_2 = 1, f \in V\}.$$

We have the minimax characterization of eigenvlaues for $0 \leqslant i \leqslant |X|-1$ (for details see [5]),

$$1 - \alpha_i = \min\{M_D(V) | \dim V = i+1\} = \max\{m_D(V) | \dim V^{\perp} = i\}.$$

Suppose we have a second reversible Markov chain on X, say K', π' with eigenvalues α_i'. From the minimax characterization: for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant |X|-1$ we have:

$$\alpha_i \leqslant 1 - \frac{a}{A}(1-\alpha_i') \text{ if } D' \leqslant AD, \pi' \geqslant a\pi. \tag{1}$$

Set $E = \{(x,y) | K(x,y) > 0\}$, and $E' = \{(x,y) | K'(x,y) > 0\}$. For each pair $x \neq y$ with $K'(x,y) > 0$, we fix a sequence of steps $x_0 = x, x_1, \ldots, x_k = y$ with $K(x_i, x_{i+1}) > 0$. This sequence of steps is called a path γ_{xy} of length $|\gamma_{xy}| = k$ (paths may have repeated vertices, but a given edge appear at most once in a given path). Set $E'(e) = \{(x,y) \in E' | e \in \gamma_{xy}\}$ for $e \in E$. We have the following theorem for a bound of A in (1), which will give an upper bound for the second largest eigenvalue.

Theorem 5 ([2]) *Let K, π and K', π' be reversible Markov chains on a finite set X. For the Dirichlet forms defined as above, then $D' \leqslant AD$ where*

$$A = \max_{(z,w) \in E}\{\frac{1}{\pi(z)K(z,w)} \sum_{E'(z,w)} |\gamma_{xy}|\pi'(x)K'(x,y)\}. \tag{2}$$

Let σ_x be a cycle from x to x with an odd number of edges (again, we may have repeated vertices but not repeated edges). For irreducible aperiodic chains, such cycles always exist. Suppose we have a fix collection of such cycles for all circles x's (one cycle for each circle). We define the cycle length by chain as

$$|\sigma_x|_K = \sum_{(z,w)\in\sigma_x} \frac{1}{K^*(z,w)}$$

where $K^*(z,w) = \pi(z)K(z,w)$ (note that K is reversible so $\pi(z)K(z,w) = \pi(w)K(w,z)$). We have a following lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of an irreducible aperiodic Markov chain.

Theorem 6 ([4]) *Let K, π be an irreducible aperiodic Markov chain, the smallest eigenvalue $\alpha_{\min} = \alpha_{|X|-1}$ satisfies*

$$\alpha_{\min} \geqslant -1 + \frac{2}{v} \tag{3}$$

where $v = \max_e \sum_{\sigma_x \ni e} |\sigma_x|_K \pi(x)$.

The relation between the mixing time and eigenvalues of the kernel is explained in the following theorem.

Theorem 7 ([4]) $\|K_t(x,.) - \pi\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leqslant \pi_*^{-1/2}\alpha_*^t/2$ *where* $\pi_* = \min_x\{\pi(x)\}$ *and* $\alpha_* = \max\{|\alpha_{|X|-1}|, \alpha_1\}$.

We now can give an estimation for the mixing time of random walk on hypergroup of circles in finite fields.

Proposition 1 $\tau_p = O(p \ln p)$.

Proof Let we explain how we obtain the result before going into the details. The proof contains 3 steps:

I. Show that $\alpha_1 \leqslant 1 - c/p$ for some c by using Theorem 5.

II. Show that $\alpha_{p-1} \geqslant -1 + d/p$ for some d by using Theorem 6.

III. Let $\eta = \min(c,d)$ then $\alpha_* \leqslant 1 - \eta/p$. We then use Theorem 7 to conclude the proof.

Now, we go into the details.

I. Consider two reversible Markov chains, (A_1, π) and $(A_1^{'}, \pi)$ where A_1 is the Markov kernel for our random walk, π is the stationary distribution in theorem 4, and A_1' is the equilibrium Markov kernel of A_1. Then $A_1^{'}$ is

the matrix with p rows of the distribution π. Therefore, all eigenvalues of $A_1^{'}$ are 1 with multiple 1, and 0 with multiple $p-1$. From (1), we have $a = 1, \alpha_i^{'} = 0$, so if $D' \leqslant AD$ then $\alpha_i \leqslant 1 - 1/A$. We want to approximate

$$A = \max_{(z,w)\in E}\{\frac{1}{\pi(z)A_1(z,w)}\sum_{E'(z,w)}|\gamma_{xy}|\pi(x)A_1'(x,y)\}. \tag{4}$$

Then we have $\alpha_1 \leqslant 1 - 1/A$.

First, we need to fix a path for each edge of $A_1^{'}$. It is clear that $(x, y) \in E'$ for all x, y. For each $x \neq y$, $x = c_r$, $y = c_s$ for some r, s. We assume that $r < s$. We define γ_{xy} as follow:

$\diamond$ If $x = c_0, y = c_1$ then $\gamma_{xy} = \{c_o, c_1\}$.

$\diamond$ If $x = c_0, y \neq c_1$ then from Theorem 2, there exists c_k such that $c_1(c_1, c_k) > 0$ and $c_1(c_k, y) > 0$. We set $\gamma_{xy} = \{c_0, c_1, c_k, y\}$.

$\diamond$ If $x, y \neq c_0$, then from Theorem 2, there exists c_k such that $c_1(x, c_k) > 0$ and $c_1(c_k, y) > 0$. We set $\gamma_{x,y} = \{x, c_k, y\}$ (**)

Let (z, w) be any edge of E, then $z = c_r$, $w = c_s$ for some r, s, we assume that $r < s$. There are 2 cases of r.

Case 1. $r = 0$, then $s = 1$ (by Theorem 1). All paths γ_{xy} that contain this edge are of form $x = c_0, c_1, c_k, y$ (we assume that quadrance of circle x is less than quadrance of circle y). By the way we define γ_{xy}, there are $p-1$ such paths and each path is of length 4. We have $\pi(x) = \pi(c_0) = 1/p^2$ and $A_1'(c_0, y) \leqslant (p + 1)/p^2$. Thus, if $r = 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\pi(z)A_1(z,w)}\sum_{E'(z,w)}|\gamma_{xy}|\pi(x)A_1'(x,y) \leqslant 4p^2(p-1)\frac{p+1}{p^4} \leqslant 4.$$

Case 2. $1 < r < s$, then all path γ_{xy} that contain this edge are of form $\{x = c_r, c_s, c_k = y\}$ or $\{x = c_k, c_r, c_s = y\}$ for some c_k. In order to have a path like that, we need k such that $rs - (k - r - s)^2/4$ is nonzero square (by Theorem 1). Thus, we have no more than $(p+3)/2$ of such k (note that not all k are choosen in (**), and we are overcounting. However, it does not matter since we are considering the worst case). Therefore, there are no more than $p+3$ of such paths, each path is of length 3. We have, $\pi(x) = (p+1)/p^2$, $A_1^{'}(x, y) = (p + 1)/p^2$, $\pi(z) = (p + 1)/p^2$ and $A_1(z, w) \geqslant 1/(p + 1)$ (from Theorem 2 and Theorem 4). Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{\pi(z)A_1(z,w)}\sum_{E'(z,w)}|\gamma_{xy}|\pi(x)A_1'(x,y) \leqslant 3\frac{(p+3)(p+1)^2}{p^2}. \tag{5}$$

From (4) and (5), we have $A \leqslant 3(p+3)(p+1)^2/p^2$. Hence

$$\alpha_1 \leqslant 1 - \frac{p^2}{3(p+3)(p+1)^2} \leqslant 1 - \frac{c}{p}$$

for some constant c.

II. We will construct a collection of cycles for A_1. We put c_0 aside and only consider $p-1$ circles $c_1, \ldots, c_{p-1}$. We call c_i and c_j adjacent if and only if $A_1(c_i, c_j) > 0$. If c_i is self-adjacent then we let $\sigma_{c_i} = \{c_i\}$. From the remaining circles, if possible, we choose any 2 adjacent circles, say c_s and c_t, then c_s, c_t are not self-adjacent. By the proof of Theorem 2, both of them are adjacent to at least $(p+1)/2$ circles, so each of them adjacent to at least $(p-1)/2$ circles from $C\backslash\{c_s, c_t\}$ (where $C = \{c_0, \ldots, c_{p-1}\}$ is the hypergroup). By Pigeon Hole Principal, there exists a circle c_u ($u \neq s, t$ but u may be zero) which is common adjacent to these circles. We set $\sigma_s = \sigma_t = \{c_s, c_t, c_u\}$. If σ_u has not yet determined, we also let $\sigma_u = \sigma_s$.

We keep doing until we have choosen all circles or we get stuck. It is easy to see that by the way of choosing cycles, we have not choosen any edge twice (in each step, we introduce a triangle that may contain an old vertice but always has 3 new edges). If we have choosen all circles, we finish our construction. If not, let we call U the set of circles that their cycles have been determined but not c_0 (even if we have defined σ_{c_0} in some step), and V for the rest, except c_0. From the construction, we see that all vertices in V are not adjacent to one another. If V has more than one circle, let c_s and c_t be any two circles in V. Then by proof of Theorem 2, c_s has at least $(p-1)/2$ adjacent circles in U, and so is c_t. We have $|U| \leqslant p-3$ (since c_0, c_s, c_t are not in U). By pigeon hole principle, there exists two circles c_u, c_v which are common adjacent to c_s, c_t. Let $\sigma_u = \{c_u, c_{u_1}, c_{u_2}\}$, we define $\sigma_s = \sigma_t = \{c_s, c_v, c_t, c_u, c_{u_1}, c_{u_2}, c_u(c_s)\}$ (odd cycles).

Suppose we have choosen k pairs in V, and conresponding k pairs in U in such a way that they are all disjoint. Let's call the set of $2k$ circles from k pairs in V (and U) V_1 (and U_1). If $V\backslash V_1$ has more than one circle, let c_m, c_n be any two circles in this set. By the proof of Theorem 2, c_m is adjacent to at least $(p-1)/2 - 2k$ circles in $U\backslash U_1$, and so is c_n. We have $|U\backslash U_1| \leqslant p-3-4k = 2((p-1)/2-2k)+2$ (since U_1, V_1 and c_0, c_n, c_m are not in U). Again, by Pigeon Hole Principle, there exists two circles $c_h, c_l \in U\backslash U_1$ which are common adjacent to c_m, c_n. Thus, we can do similarly as above for these four circles.

We keep doing until we have no more than one circle left in V. During the process, each pair in V and its conrespoding (in U) are disjoint so all edges from V to U are used in only 2 cycles. Consider any cycle in U which is

triangle by the construction. When choosing pairs of circles from V, vertices of U are chosen no more than 3 times. So in total, any edge of any cycle in U belongs to no more than $1 + 3 \times 2 = 7$ cycles. Now, we have at most 2 circles left (at most one from V and c_0). For any circle whose its cycle has not yet determined we assign to it any odd cycle of length $\leqslant 5$ that contains it (there exists such cycle by Theorem 2). So, each edge belongs to no more than 9 cycles, and each cycle has no more than 7 edges.

For each (z, w) such that $A_1(z, w) > 0$ we have

$$A_1^*(z, w) = \pi(z)A_1(z, w) \leqslant 2/p^2.$$

So for each cycle σ_{c_i}, $|\sigma_{c_i}|_{A_1} \leqslant 7p^2$. We have

$$v = \max_e \sum_{\sigma_{c_i} \ni e} |\sigma_{c_i}|_{A_1} \pi(c_i) \leqslant 9 \times 7p^2 \times \frac{p+1}{p^2} = 63(p+1).$$

Hence, by Theorem 6 we have $\alpha_{p-1} \geqslant 1 - 2/63(p+1)$. Thus there exists a constant $d > 0$ such that $\alpha_{p-1} \geqslant 1 - d/p$.

III. Let $\eta = \min(c, d)$, then $\alpha_* \leqslant 1 - \eta/p$. By Theorem 7 we have

$$\|K_t(x, .) - \pi\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\pi_*^{-\frac{1}{2}}\alpha_*^t \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\pi_*^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1 - \frac{\eta}{p})^t$$

where $\pi_* = \min_x\{\pi(x)\} = \pi(c_0) = 1/p^2$. Thus,

$$\|K_t(x, .) - \pi\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leqslant \frac{p(1 - \frac{\eta}{p})^t}{2}.$$

Therefore, $\|K_t(x, .) - \pi\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leqslant 1/2e$ if $p(1 - \eta/p)^t/2 \leqslant 1/2e$. It is equivalent to $1 + p + t\ln(1 - \eta/p) \leqslant 0$ or $1 + p + t(-\eta/p - \eta^2/p^2 - \ldots) \leqslant 0$. So we can choose any t such that $\eta(1 + \ln p)p \leqslant t$. This concludes the proof. □

2.2 Probabilistic approach

In this section, we will prove a better bound for τ_p by using probabilistic approach, the coupling technique.

Proposition 2 *Given $p \in \mathcal{P}, p \equiv 3$ (mod 4). If $(1 - p^2(p-1)/(1+p)^4)^n < 1/2e$ then $r_p \leqslant 4n$.*

Proof We create two copies of random walk c_1^n. The first one starts from c_i for fixed i and the second one starts from circles with distribution π. In

step m, suppose that we are in circle c_t in the first walk and in circle c_s in the second walk for some s, t. If $t = s$ then in the next step, we choose the step of the second walk which is the same with the first's. Otherwise, let they walk by A_1 independently. It is clearly that both random walks have the same Markov kernel A_1 and the second one has the distribution π.

Claim: $A_1^4(c_i, c_j) \geqslant \frac{p^2(p-1)}{(1+p)^4}\pi(c_j)$ for all i, j.

Proof. We consider 4 separated cases

1) $i = j = 0$. There are $|C_1|^4 = (p+1)^4$ possible ways to go by 4 steps. We first go by any 2 steps. In the last two, we just go backward then it is clear that we go back to the starting point. Therefore, at least $|C_1|^2 = (p+1)^2$ ways to go from c_0 to c_0. It implies that

$$A_1^4(c_0, c_0) \geqslant \frac{(p+1)^2}{(p+1)^4} > \frac{p^2(p-1)}{(1+p)^4}\pi(c_j) = \frac{p-1}{(p+1)^4}.$$

2) $i = 0, j \neq 0$. We have

$$A_1^4(c_0, c_j) = \sum_{l,k} A_1(c_0, c_1)A_1(c_1, c_l)A_1(c_l, c_k)A_1(c_k, c_j).$$

By Theorem 2, we have for each $l \neq 0$ then exists $k \neq 0$ such that

$$A_1(c_l, c_k)A_1(c_k, c_j) > 0.$$

But $A_1(c_u, c_v) > 0$, then $A_1(c_u, c_v) \geqslant 1/(p+1)$. Since $\Pr(l = 0) = n_{11}^0 = 1/(p+1)$ we have

$$A_1^4(c_0, c_j) \geqslant \frac{1}{(p+1)^2}\Pr(l \neq 0) = \frac{p}{(p+1)^3}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$A_1^4(c_0, c_j) \geqslant \frac{p^3}{(p+1)^4}\frac{(p+1)}{p^2} > \frac{p^2(p-1)}{(p+1)^4}\pi(c_j).$$

3) $i \neq 0, j = 0$. Similar as 2), we have

$$A_1^4(c_i, c_0) \geqslant \frac{p^3}{(p+1)^4}\frac{(p+1)}{p^2} > \frac{p^3}{(p+1)^4}\frac{1}{p^2} > \frac{p^2(p-1)}{(p+1)^4}\pi(c_j).$$

4) $i, j \neq 0$. We have

$$A_1^4(c_i, c_j) = \sum_{t,l,k} A_1(c_i, c_t)A_1(c_t, c_l)A_1(c_l, c_k)A_1(c_k, c_j).$$

Similar as in 2), we have

$$A_1^4(c_i, c_j) \geqslant \frac{1}{(p+1)^2} \Pr(l \neq 0) = \frac{1}{(p+1)^2}(1 - \Pr(l = 0)).$$

But

$$\Pr(l = 0) = \sum_t A_1(c_i, c_t) A_1(c_t, c_0) = n_{11}^i \leqslant \frac{2}{p+1}.$$

So we have

$$A_1^4(c_i, c_j) \geqslant \frac{p-1}{(p+1)^3} = \frac{p^2(p-1)}{(p+1)^4}\pi(c_j).$$

This finishes the proof of the claim.

Set $c = 1 - p^2(p-1)/(1+p)^4$. From the claim, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathrm{TV}}(A_1^4(c_i, .), \pi) &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_j |\pi(c_j) - A_1^4(c_i, c_j)| \\ &= \sum_{j: A_1^4(c_i,c_j) < \pi(c_j)} (\pi(c_j) - A_1^4(c_i, c_j)) \\ &\leqslant \sum_{j: A_1^4(c_i,c_j) < \pi(c_j)} \pi(c_j)(1-c) \\ &\leqslant 1 - c. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the above inequality t times, we have

$$d_{\mathrm{TV}}(A_1^{4t}(c_i, .), \pi) \leqslant (1-c)^t.$$

Therefore, if $(1 - p^2(p-1)/(1+p)^4)^n < 1/2e$ then $d_{\mathrm{TV}}(A_1^{4t}(c_i, .), \pi) \leqslant 1/2e$ and $\tau_p \leqslant 4n$ (Q.E.D) □

As a corollary we have the following theorem.

Theorem 8 $\tau_p = O(p)$.

Proof The inequality $(1 - p^2(p-1)/(1+p)^4)^n < 1/2e$ is equivalent to

$$n \log\left(1 - \frac{p^2(p-1)}{(1+p)^4}\right) < -\ln 2 - 1.$$

Therefore n need to satisfy

$$n\left(\frac{p^2(p-1)}{(p+1)^4} + \frac{p^4(p-1)^2}{(1-p)^8} + \ldots\right) > 1 + \ln 2.$$

Thus, $n > \frac{(1+\log 2)(p+1)^4}{p^2(p-1)}$. This conludes the proof. □

Acknowlegment

The original impetus of this research was given by my supervisor, A.Prof Norman Wildberger. I am grateful for his helpful discussions and numerous invaluable suggestions.

References

[1] P. Diaconis and L. Saloff-Coste, *Random Walks on Finite Groups*, A Survey of Analytic Techniques, with Prob. Meas. on Groups XI, H. Heyer (ed.), World Scientific Singapore, pp. 44-75.

[2] P. Diaconis and L. Saloff-Coste, *Comparison Theorems for Reversible Markov Chains*, Ann. Appl. Prob, vol. 3, pp. 696-730.

[3] P. Diaconis and L. Saloff-Coste, *Comparison Techniques for Random Walk on Finite Groups*, Ann. Prob., vol. 21, pp. 2131-2156.

[4] P. Diaconis and D. Stroock, *Geometric bounds for eigenvalues of Markov chains*, Ann. Appl. Prob., vol. 1, pp. 36-61.

[5] R. Horn and C. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985.

[6] N.J. Wildberger, *Finite commutative hypergroups and applications from group theory to conformal field theory, Applications of Hypergroups and Related Measure Algebras*, Contemp. Math. 183 Proceedings Seattle 1993 (AMS), pp. 413-434.

[7] N. J. Wildberger, *Divine Proportions: Rational trigonometry to universal geometry*, WildEgg, 2005.